The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Eight Edition, August 2001, §2131, specifies that a given claim is anticipated "only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference," citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, MPEP §2131 indicates that the cited reference must show the "identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim," citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). For the reasons identified below, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish anticipation of claims 1-4, 6 and 9 by the McCauley reference.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for use in a computer network. The apparatus comprises at least one server within the network, the server being operative to process a client request generated by a client device to determine a particular client type associated with the client device, to retrieve web content identified in the client request, to retrieve one or more augmentation files associated with at least one of the web content and the particular client type, and to alter the retrieved web content in accordance with the one or more augmentation files, wherein the altered web content is delivered to the client device. The claim also specifies that the server parses the retrieved web content into one or more component structures, and subsequently applies a pattern matching process to recognize designated component structure subject to alteration in accordance with the one or more augmentation files.

Thus, the claim calls for a server that retrieves not only web content, but also one or more augmentation files associated with at least one of the web content and the particular client type. Furthermore, the claimed server, subsequent to parsing of the retrieved web content into component structures, applies the pattern matching process to recognize designated component structure subject to alteration in accordance with the one or more augmentation files.

The McCauley reference fails to meet the above-noted limitations of claim 1, and in fact teaches away from the claim limitations.

The Examiner argues that the claimed server is met by the information server system 12 of FIG. 1, and more particularly relies on the disclosure in the abstract, summary, column 4, lines 20-

67, column 5, lines 5-35, and column 6, lines 20-50, of McCauley. However, the relied-upon portions fail to disclose a server that operates in the manner claimed.

For example, there is no reference in the relied-upon portions of McCauley regarding a server which, subsequent to parsing of the retrieved web content into component structures, applies a pattern matching process to recognize designated component structure subject to alteration in accordance with the one or more augmentation files. Instead, McCauley at column 6, lines 17-45, provides as follows, with emphasis supplied:

> Dispatcher 40 is the supervisory part of server application program 17. In response to a request for an information page, the dispatcher selects and initiates an appropriate page renderer based on which client viewer the requesting client is using.
>
> The various available page renderers are configured to tailor renderings of the information pages specifically for the individual requesting clients, in response to characteristics of the clients such as display and communication characteristics. For example, an HTML page renderer decides whether to use frames or tables based on the browser capabilities of the client. As another example, the HTML page renderer controls the visual formatting and layout of page renderings on client computers through its selection of pane renderers, as will be more fully described below. The page renderer, in conjunction with the selected pane renderers, emits instructions for individual clients in accordance with the tailored renderings of the information pages.
>
> Every page renderer reads and uses a page specification to decide how to render an information page. An individual information page has only a single page specification, which is used by any page renderer attempting to render the information page. Each page specification includes pane specifications for individual panes within the information page. A pane, as used herein, is an individual portion, area, or sub-division of an information page. A page is made up of one or more panes, and all page information is presented within one of such panes.

Thus, the dispatcher 40 of the server application program 17 simply determines page renderers based on browser capabilities or other characteristics of the requesting clients. There is no teaching or suggestion regarding the claimed application of a pattern matching process to recognize designated component structure subject to alteration in accordance with one or more augmentation files. In fact, the use of page renderers that are selected and applied based on client characteristics as described in McCauley is a direct teaching away from the claimed invention, since it is performed in a manner which does not require application of a pattern matching process subsequent to parsing of retrieved web content into one or more component structures.

In addition, Applicants note that McCauley in column 11, lines 46-64, indicates that particular pane renderers of a given page renderer are automatically applied to corresponding pre-identified portions of a web page, such as title and menu portions. Each such portion of a given web page has its own predetermined pane renderer. Therefore, it is clear that there is no need whatsoever in McCauley for application of a pattern matching process of the type claimed, in order to recognize designated component structure that is subject to alteration in accordance with one or more augmentation files.

Applicants further note that the terms "pattern" or "matching" apparently do not appear anywhere in the text of the McCauley reference. It is difficult to imagine how a reference that mentions neither patterns nor matching could be viewed as anticipatory of a claim which includes explicit pattern matching limitations.

Accordingly, since McCauley fails to meet each and every limitation of claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated by McCauley.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-12 and 15 are believed allowable for at least the reasons identified above with regard to claim 1. The Tso and Li references cited by the Examiner fail to supplement the fundamental deficiencies of McCauley as applied to claim 1. The §103(a) rejections of dependent claims 6, 7, 10 and 11 over McCauley in combination with Tso or Li are therefore respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 18-20 each include limitations similar to claim 1, and are believed allowable for substantially the same reasons that claim 1 is believed allowable.

With regard to independent claim 13, this claim calls for a virtual client device having a combination of a plurality of different sets of features provided by multiple distinct physical client devices. An illustrative example of such an arrangement is described in the present specification at page 11, lines 17-20. In formulating the §103(a) rejection of claim 13 over a proposed combination of McCauley and Chintakrindi, the Examiner argues that the virtual device 114 shown in FIG. 1 of Chintakrindi meets the claimed client device which comprises a virtual client device. Applicants respectfully disagree. First, the claim calls for a client device that comprises a virtual client device, while virtual device 114 of Chintakrindi is clearly part of server system 100, and not client system 140. Thus, virtual device 114 is not a client device as claimed. Also, Chintakrindi at column 2, lines 64-65, indicates that each virtual device 114 represents "a particular physical device 160." Therefore, a given virtual device 114 does not have a combination of a plurality of different sets of features provided by multiple distinct physical client devices. The collective disclosure of the proposed combination of McCauley and Chintakrindi thus fails to meet the limitations of independent claim 13.

Independent claim 14 includes limitations similar to those of claim 13, and is believed allowable for the reasons identified above.

With regard to independent claims 16 and 17, the limitations therein relating to default augmentation files are not disclosed in the collective teachings of the cited references, taken alone or in any combination. The Examiner fails to address these particular limitations with an appropriate level of specificity, and Applicants have been unable to find the limitations in the proffered set of references.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections. The pending claims 1-7 and 9-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 6, 2004

Joseph B. Ryan
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 37,922
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-7517